

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

5 November 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR: Edward J. Maloney

FROM:

SUBJECT: Comments on the ADP Support to DA Office Memo

1. The proposal is a bold and ambitious one. MISG's basic position is that while we have reservations about some aspects of the plan (listed below), we will enthusiastically support it and will do our best to make it work. The question of centralization/decentralization can be debated forever. It's clear that many DA offices are not satisfied, justified or otherwise, with the level of service received from OIT. The time has come for OIT to implement the decentralized approach and see if it really helps to solve the problem.

2. Several items need to be considered and monitored as this new approach is implemented. None of the items listed below are "show-stoppers" but lack of attention to detail during implementation in any of them will likely create a subtle new set of problems that will arise over time and detract from the overall initiative.

3. Presumably, OIT will mandate standards for each OIT "satellite" component to follow. In reality, this will be difficult to do. It is always an open question as to how closely standards should be followed, versus adapting to local preferences and circumstances as to how the job should/can best be done. The most likely result over time is that each DA office will end up doing things pretty much their own way. This is not necessarily a total negative by any means, but any expectation that "standards" will be followed will probably remain unfulfilled.

4. If we're really going to do this, it's IMPORTANT to go ahead and rapidly move the affected people/positions out of MISG/GOG and into the DA offices. Leaving people in place (at least in MISG) for 6-12 months must be avoided in order to a) accomplish the objective of the new plan, and b) enable the

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

remnants of MISG to pick up and aggressively get on with the remaining mission-related job that needs to be done in the non-DA areas. While space, by any account is an obvious problem, a measure of the seriousness by which the DA offices support this plan will be the speed with which they free up their space to make it happen. Slowness in this regard will likely indicate that DA offices either don't really believe this plan to be a benefit to them (a two-edged sword perhaps?) or don't understand what they're supposed to do to make it work.

5. MISG has traditionally been a "source of bodies" whenever a new project or short-fuze task arises, especially with respect to the DA. (The latest examples are the recent OP and OS efforts.) At least with respect to DA support, those days will be over. In addition to (by definition) not having the bodies in the first place for DA work, the charter will have changed as well. DA offices should understand this, but probably won't until they are told "no" for the first time. The DA offices are, for all intents and purposes, on their own and will have to make do with the onsite resources available to them.

6. In order to provide de-centralized production support, the number of people needed will most likely increase. If the customer benefits received exceed the incremental additional cost, then it's money well-spent. The only point is that the increased cost should be recognized up front.

7. The argument in paragraph 8 of the reference memorandum which states that OIT must maintain centralized control of the overseas development activity is an important one, but one that seems to be weakly justified. It is not intuitively obvious that "complexity and constraints" automatically requires centralized OIT program management. To wit, it's easy to envision OF (to pick an office at random) thinking that "OF problems are OF problems," whether domestic or overseas. In particular, with an aggressive manager and (due to the decentralized plan) an infusion of significantly more powerful technical resources, they can be expected to step out in this arena in the absence of a DDA-issued prohibition to the contrary (which may exist, but not sure if it does.) OIT can, all bureaucratic considerations aside, do a better and more comprehensive job in this area than a collection of loosely (at best) coordinated DA offices. The suggestion, in a phrase, is to STRENGTHEN the arguments in paragraph 8 of the memo to the DDA that preserve this charter for OIT.

8. A strong, vibrant MZ career service is of STRATEGIC value to the Agency given that CIA is one gigantic "information factory" which needs information technology to produce it's product. The risk that's run with the decentralized approach is MZ careerists will, over time, "drift" from the fold. A policy of strongly encouraged (if not mandatory) rotations should be part and parcel of the new plan. We do not want to have able bodies encouraged or given subtle incentives to stay in place forever in any DA office. Certain people will no doubt want to, but the key OIT people

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

should go into the satellite job knowing it's not permanent nor is it forever. They must view themselves as OIT careerists who are on a 2-3 year assignment, and not OF or OL or whatever bodies who belong to something called the MZ service which is useful for getting training courses or something. Perhaps an obvious point, but one that should be kept clearly in mind lest the Law of Unintended Consequences become a factor in the new plan to decentralize DA ADP services.

STAT

Distribution:

STAT

- addressee

-

-

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY